

## Remarks

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated August 14, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on November 14, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

In the specification, the paragraphs [0014], [0027], [0038], [0051], [0054], and [0068] have been amended to correct minor editorial problems.

Claims 5, 23, and 44-60 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 1-4, 6-22, and 24-32 have been canceled by Applicant without prejudice. Claims 5 and 23 stand rejected by the Examiner. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for the reasons presented below.

Claims 5 and 23 are amended to be placed in independent form. New claims 44-60 are supported by previously presented claims 3-9, 13-15, 18-20, 24, 25, and 30-32. These amendments are not presented to distinguish a reference, thus, the claims as amended are entitled to a full range of equivalents if not previously amended to distinguish a reference.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 20020002991 A1 to *Lindner* and U.S. Patent No. 6,824,621 to *Shibagaki* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,167,893 to *Taatjes*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

*Lindner*, *Shibagaki*, and *Taatjes* do not teach, show, or suggest a spin rinse dry cell comprising a fixed substrate support post member comprising a substantially horizontal substrate support surface having an angled substrate guide surface positioned radially outward of the substrate support surface as asserted by the Examiner because *Taatjes*, which the Examiner utilizes for the teaching of the substrate support post member, does not have a fixed substrate support post member with an angled substrate guide surface positioned radially outward of the substrate support surface. The substrate in *Taatjes* is supported on support pins 110A-110C. The support pins 110A-110C do not have an angled substrate guide surface positioned radially outward of the substrate support surface (see Figure 2A of *Taatjes*). Therefore,

*Lindner*, *Shibagaki*, and *Taatjes*, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest a spin rinse dry cell comprising a fixed substrate support post member comprising a substantially horizontal substrate support surface having an angled substrate guide surface positioned radially outward of the substrate support surface, as recited in claim 5. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 20020002991 A1 to *Lindner* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,167,893 to *Taatjes*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

*Lindner* and *Taatjes* do not teach, show, or suggest a substrate rinsing cell wherein the inner fixed substrate support member comprises a post having an upper substantially horizontal substrate supporting surface and an inclined substrate centering surface positioned radially outward of the substrate supporting surface as asserted by the Examiner because *Taatjes*, which the Examiner utilizes for the teaching of the substrate support post, does not have a fixed substrate support post with an inclined substrate centering surface positioned radially outward of the substrate support surface. The substrate in *Taatjes* is supported on support pins 110A-110C. The support pins 110A-110C do not have an angled substrate guide surface positioned radially outward of the substrate support surface (see Figure 2A of *Taatjes*). Therefore, *Lindner* and *Taatjes*, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest a substrate rinsing cell wherein the inner fixed substrate support member comprises a post having an upper substantially horizontal substrate supporting surface and an inclined substrate centering surface positioned radially outward of the substrate supporting surface, as recited in claim 23, and claims dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New claims 44-51, which depend from claim 23, are believed to be allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons discussed above in relation to claim 23. New claims 52-61, which include the limitation that the substrate support post member further comprises a substantially horizontal substrate support surface having an angled substrate guide surface positioned radially outward of the substrate support surface currently claimed in claim 5, are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above in regards to *Taatjes* in relation to claim 5.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Keith M. Tackett  
Registration No. 32,008  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for the Applicants